EXHIBIT 1 FILED UNDER SEAL

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                            MARSHALL DIVISION
     NETLIST, INC.,
                                      ( CAUSE NO. 2:21-CV-463-JRG
 3
                                     )
                Plaintiff,
 4
 5
     VS.
 6
     SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., (
     et al.,
                                      ) MARSHALL, TEXAS
                                      ( MARCH 29, 2023
 7
                Defendants.
                                     ) 9:00 A.M.
 8
 9
                                 VOLUME 2
10
11
                            PRETRIAL CONFERENCE
12
                   BEFORE THE HONORABLE RODNEY GILSTRAP
                    UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
2.1
22
                        SHAWN McROBERTS, RMR, CRR
                          100 E. HOUSTON STREET
                          MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670
23
                              (903) 923-8546
                    shawn mcroberts@txed.uscourts.gov
24
25
```

changed it. 1 THE COURT: So you carried what was in the 2 preliminary infringement contentions forward into subsequent 3 iterations. 4 MR. SHEASBY: All the way. We've been saying LDO is 5 6 the converter circuit from the beginning, and then at the end of fact discovery they say LDO can't be a converter circuit, 7 and then we're in a situation to have to scramble. 8 THE COURT: All right. What else, Mr. Sheasby? 9 MR. SHEASBY: The alleged state of mind, this is 10 There are highlights in the 11 sort of a difficult thing. paragraph where Mr. -- Doctor Mangione-Smith hypothesizes 12 about what Samsung's state of mind would be, but there are 13 vast elements of that paragraph that just discuss the factual 14 record about when Samsung was on notice, objectively on notice 15 of certain things. And so based on the Court's order 16 17 yesterday, I think the idea that an expert -- I think you said that for Mr. Halbert that experts should not be hypothesizing 18

THE COURT: That would apply here as well.

on the state of mind of --

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

MR. SHEASBY: That would apply here as well. And that would be a blanket thing, but the paragraphs contain lots of perfectly appropriate things about notice and state of mind. So on those paragraphs I would just ask that the Court apply the same standard.

2.0

2.1

2.2

If the Court has any questions, I'll move on to the next one.

THE COURT: No. I mean, my intention here from the briefing and hearing Defendant's argument until you addressed it was to basically say Doctor Mangione-Smith is not going to be permitted to opine on Samsung's state of mind. Now, that should be adequate guidance without going back and taking paragraphs and saying this sentence is in and this sentence is out. And there's no reason why counsel for both sides can't do that with the kind of high-level guidance I'm giving. But that is the Court's guidance—the witness is not going to opine on Samsung's state of mind.

MR. SHEASBY: Okay. And then in terms of the Sung
Mo Jung's deposition testimony, I think -- so first off,
Doctor Mangione-Smith will testify that he read the entire
deposition testimony, I believe. As to the --

THE COURT: This is the one with the errata?

MR. SHEASBY: Yes, this is the one with the errata. I don't think he has the memory to say, I read the pages of the errata or not. They were given to him. As to whether he physically read the errata, we don't know the answer to that because he doesn't remember it anymore. But we know that the original is part of the record, so you can't get away from the original. The way this works is you have the original and then they can also put in the corrected version. And Doctor